REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

Declaration

Applicant submits herewith an application data sheet that identifies the residence addresses and citizenship of the inventors. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the declaration be withdrawn.

Drawings

With regard to FIGs. 11 and 13, it is respectfully submitted that the text in the description and the figures need not match. With regard to FIG. 17, it is respectfully submitted that the process flow diagram relates to steps after conversion of adapted messages to generic messages. With regard to FIG. 6, it is noted that the description has been amended to delete references to 610a and 610b. With regard to FIG. 3, it is respectfully noted that paragraph 44 and 48 identify references 247 and 295. With regard to FIG. 4, paragraph 54 of the description has been amended to recite the SyncStore databases 150a. With regard to FIG. 5, paragraph 56 has been amended to recite objects 530, 535 With regard to FIG. 12, the description has been amended to recite item 1250. With regard to FIG. 13, paragraphs 84 and 85 have been amended to recite items 1310, 1335. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that all reference characters comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p(3). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objections regarding the drawings be withdrawn.

Specification

Each of the comments regarding the specification have been addressed by amending the corresponding passages in the specification. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this basis for objection be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Each of the objections relating to the claims have been addressed through amendments to the claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this basis for objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the generic messages in line 9 refer to generic messages converted from the adapted messages. Similar amendments were made to claims 11 and 20. Such an amendment clearly links the recited generic messages to the adapted messages thereby obviating any clarity / antecedent basis issues.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 7, as a dependent claim, can recite acts that can occur if certain conditions are met without reciting alternatives if other conditions are met. The same reasoning also applies to claims 7 and 17.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the bases for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §§ 102 / 103

Claims 1-6, 8-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102, as being anticipated by Multer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,694,336 B1; "Multer"). Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over Multer in view of Falls et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,771; "Falls"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite: "the data objects on the second platform being updated based on stored mapping data, the stored mapping data being generated via user-generated input manipulating a mapping chart illustrating a mapping of variables from data objects on the first platform to data objects on the second platform (for support, see, inter alia, specification pars. 77-78). Claim 11 was similarly amended.

Neither of Multer or Falls describe an arrangement as recited in claim 1 wherein a mapping chart that illustrates a mapping of variables from data objects on the first platform to data objects on the second platform that can be manipulated by a user. While Multer refers to an "application object... to map data from the application into a temporary or "universal" data structure by connecting to the application via any number of standard interfaces to gain access to the applications data. The data structure of the application object puts the data in a generic or "universal" data format which may be used by the device engine components to generate data packages for provision to the storage server" (see Multer col. 11, lines 49-57), there is no suggestion within Multer that a mapping chart that maps variables of objects on a first platform can be visually mapped and manipulated in relation to variables of objects on a second platform. Moreover, Falls fails to disclose or otherwise suggest use of any type of user-generated input manipulating a mapping chart. Therefore, the skilled artisan would not have resulted in the subject matter of claims 1 and 11 by combining Multer with Falls.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 11 should be allowable.

Claim 20 has been amended to recite: "creating a set of generic messages identifying changes to the data objects on the primary platform since a previous synchronization; accessing a database to obtain a user identifier, the user identifier being associated with the user and linking to one or more device identifiers, the device identifiers identifying the plurality of auxiliary platforms; converting the generic messages to adapted messages for each of the auxiliary platforms based on the obtained user identifier and the linked device identifiers; sending the adapted messages from the primary platform to the corresponding auxiliary platforms; converting the adapted messages to generic messages on each of the auxiliary platforms; and updating the data objects on the respective auxiliary platforms using the generic messages converted from the adapted messages" (for support, see, inter alia, specification par. 54).

Neither of the cited references disclose or otherwise suggest an arrangement in which a user identifier is linked to one or more device identifiers which allow a principal computing platform to be coupled to a plurality of auxiliary platforms as recited in claim 20. Therefore, the skilled artisan would not have adapted Multer or Falls to result in the subject matter of claim 20.

Accordingly, claim 20 is allowable.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be

construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-281.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 11, 2007

Carl A. Kukkonen, III
Reg. No. 42,773

Address all written correspondence to
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
9255 Towne Centre Drive, Suite 600
San Diego, CA 92121
Customer No. 64280
Phone: 858.320.3000
Fax: 858.320.3001

– 22 –